

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

WAYNE F. PIERSON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No.: 9:09-1639-TLW
	)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, COMMISSIONER	)	
OF SOCIAL SECURITY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff has brought this action *pro se* to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the defendant, Commissioner of Social Security, denying his claims for disability benefits. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. (Doc. # 25). No objections were filed in this case. Additionally, the plaintiff did not file a brief setting forth the basis of his claim.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de

novo, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. # 25). Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

February 28, 2011  
Florence, South Carolina